

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-14 and 16-22 are pending in the application. Reconsideration in view the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-14 and 16-22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yeager et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,758,112). Claims 1, 13 and 19 are amended. Claim 6 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited sections of Yeager teach, suggest or reflect at least a processor, comprising: a physical register file populated by a number of registers; an instruction decoder; a register alias table coupled to the instruction decoder; an active list populated by a number of entries, the entries include an old field and a new field; a free list of unallocated physical registers reclaimed from said active list; and a misprediction condition wherein said free list reclaims mispredicted allocated said physical registers from said new field (e.g., as recited in amended claim 1).

The cited reference Yeager does not contain such limitations anywhere in its disclosure. The Office Action asserts the limitation a misprediction condition wherein the free list reclaimed mispredicted said allocated physical registers from said new field can be found at column 16 lines 30-33. Column 16 lines 30-33 states:

“On a cycle after an exception is detected, the mapping tables are sequentially restored using the logical destination field 290 and old destination field 292 in active list 212, as shown in FIG. 2. ”

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited section does not disclose, teach or suggest “...a misprediction condition wherein *said free list reclaims mispredicted allocated said physical registers from said new field*” (emphasis added) as in the embodiment of claim 1. First, Applicants respectfully submit that the misprediction condition of reclaiming physical registers is not similar to that of the restoring procedure using mapping tables

disclosed in Yeager. Moreover, claim 1 specifically recites that the use of the free list to reclaim the mispredicted physical registers from the said new field. Support can be found at least at page 8 line 11 of the specification which states the following: “According to embodiments of the present invention, free list 304 can recover physical registers by pushing back all physical registers that are indicated in new field 310 past the misprediction condition. Physical registers R4 and R5 are to be recovered by free list 304”. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited section of Yeager does not teach suggest or disclose a free list reclaiming physical registers as specifically recited in claim 1.

Also, as specifically recited in the cited section, Yeager in its restoring procedure requires the use of a logical destination field 290 and the old destination field 292 of the active list. The old destination fields of Yeager are not the equivalent of the new field described in the embodiment of independent claim 1. The logical destination field 290 is also not the equivalent of the new field of independent claim 1. Therefore, Yeager also does not teach suggest or disclose the use of the new field to reclaim physical registers as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, since at least the limitations “...a misprediction condition wherein said free list reclaims mispredicted allocated said physical registers from said new field” are not taught or suggested anywhere in the Yeager reference, independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance and the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection should be withdrawn. Independent claims 8, 13 and 19 include similar limitations and are in condition for allowance and the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection should be withdrawn. Claims 2-5, 7, 9-12, 14, 16-18 and 20-22 depend from allowable independent claims and therefore are allowable also.

For at least the above reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 975-7500 to discuss any matter concerning this application. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. **11-0600**.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

Dated: September 7, 2004

By:



Sumit Bhattacharya

(Reg. No. 51,469)

Attorneys for Intel Corporation

KENYON & KENYON
333 W. San Carlos St., Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110
Telephone: (408) 975-7500
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501

RECEIVED

SEP 14 2004

Technology Center 2100